arXiv:1302.5697v1 [math.GR] 22 Feb 2013

CRITERIA FOR SOLVABLE RADICAL MEMBERSHIP VIA p-ELEMENTS

SIMON GUEST AND DAN LEVY

Abstract. Guralnick, Kunyavskii, Plotkin and Shalev have shown that the solvable radical of a finite group G can be characterized as the set of all $x \in G$ such that $\langle x, y\rangle$ is solvable for all $y \in G$. We prove two generalizations of this result. Firstly, it is enough to check the solvability of $\langle x, y\rangle$ for every p-element $y \in G$ for every odd prime p. Secondly, if x has odd order, then it is enough to check the solvability of $\langle x, y\rangle$ for every 2-element $y \in G$.

1. Introduction

Let G be a finite group and let $R(G)$ denote the solvable radical of G; that is, the (unique) largest, solvable, normal subgroup of G. We present two characterizations of $R(G)$. The first one is given in Theorem 1.

Theorem 1. *Let G be a finite group and let $x \in G$. Then $x \in R(G)$ if and only if for all odd primes p and all p-elements $y \in G$, the subgroup $\langle x, y\rangle$ is solvable.*

The next result gives an $R(G)$ membership criterion for odd order p-elements.

Theorem 2. *Let G be a finite group, and let $x \in G$ be a p-element, where p is an odd prime. The element x is contained in $R(G)$ if and only if the subgroup $\langle x, y\rangle$ is solvable for all 2-elements $y \in G$.*

Our second characterization of $R(G)$ follows easily from Theorems 1 and 2. First we need some notation. Denote the order of $x \in G$ by $o(x)$ and write $o(x) = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}$, where the p_i are distinct primes. Then there exists a unique (up to the order of the factors) factorization $x = x_{p_1} \cdots x_{p_k}$, where x_{p_i} is a p_i-element and each $x_{p_i} = x^{k_i}$ for some integer k_i. Note that for any subgroup A, the element x is contained in A if and only if x_{p_i} is contained in A for each $i = 1, \dots, k$. Now define $x_{2'} = x x_2^{-1} (= x_2^{-1} x)$ so that $o(x) = o(x_2)o(x_{2'})$. We can now state our second characterization of $R(G)$.

Corollary 3. *Let G be a finite group and let $x \in G$. The element $x = x_2 x_{2'}$ is contained in $R(G)$ if and only if both*
(i) *the subgroup $\langle x_2, y\rangle$ is solvable all p-elements $y \in G$ for all odd primes p; and*
(ii) *the subgroup $\langle x_{2'}, y\rangle$ is solvable for all 2-elements $y \in G$.*
In particular, if x has odd order, then $x \in R(G)$ if and only if $\langle x, y\rangle$ is solvable for all 2-elements $y \in G$.

Proof. If $x \in R(G)$, then (i) and (ii) follow from elementary properties of $R(G)$. Conversely, suppose that (i) and (ii) hold. Now (ii) implies that $\langle x_{p_i}, y\rangle$ is solvable for all 2-elements $y \in G$ for each odd p_i since $\langle x_{p_i}, y\rangle \le \langle x_{2'}, y\rangle$. By Theorem 2, x_{p_i} is contained in $R(G)$ for each odd p_i and thus $x_{2'} \in R(G)$. But $x_2 \in R(G)$ by (i) and Theorem 1 and so $x = x_2 x_{2'} \in R(G)$. □

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we briefly review some of the previous results that motivate our work. In Section 3, we describe our notation, and we state various background results on which our proofs rely. In Section 4 we reduce the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2 to proving certain properties of almost simple groups, and in Section 5 we prove these properties.

2. ELEMENTWISE CONDITIONS FOR SOLVABILITY AND SOLVABLE RADICAL MEMBERSHIP

Consider conditions on elements $x \in G$ that ensure either the solvability of G or that $x \in R(G)$. We will call such conditions *elementwise conditions*. Since G is solvable if and only if $G = R(G)$, a criterion for $R(G)$ membership always implies a solvability criterion for G. However, the sharpest solvability criteria for G do not arise as special cases of $R(G)$ membership criteria.

Among the elementwise conditions we can distinguish between
(i) *order arithmetic conditions*, that is, arithmetic conditions based on the orders of the elements of G and $R(G)$; and
(ii) *k-generator subgroup conditions*, that is, conditions that require the solvability of subgroups generated by k elements with specified properties (for some small integer $k \geq 2$).

An example of an order arithmetic condition is Thompson's solvability criterion ([37, Corollary 3], see also [35, 22]), which states that G is solvable if and only if there does not exist a triple (a, b, c) of nontrivial elements of G, with pairwise coprime orders, such that $abc = 1$. Another suggestion for an order arithmetic condition, whose proof has been reduced to an open question about simple groups, can be found in [24].

We review some of the main k-generator subgroup conditions, since the results in this paper are of this type.

(a) *Solvability criteria for G*

(a1) Thompson [37, Corollary 2] (1968): G is solvable if and only if $\langle x, y\rangle$ is solvable for all $x, y \in G$.

(a2) Guralnick and Wilson [18] (2000): G is solvable if and only if the proportion of pairs $(x, y) \in G \times G$ (with $x \neq y$) for which $\langle x, y\rangle$ is solvable is at least $11/30$.

(a3) The first author [15] (2010) (and (independently) Gordeev, Grunewald, Kunyavskii, and Plotkin in [12] (2010)): G is solvable if and only if $\langle x, x^y\rangle$ is solvable for all $x, y \in G$.

(a4) Kaplan and the second author [25] (2010) and both authors [17] (2011) (somewhat improving on [25]): G is solvable if and only if for all odd primes p, except possibly one, all p-elements $x \in G$ and all 2-elements $y \in G$, the subgroup $\langle x, x^y\rangle$ is solvable.

(a5) Dolfi, Guralnick, Herzog and Praeger in [8] (2011): G is solvable if and only if for every pair (C, D) of distinct conjugacy classes consisting of elements of prime power order, there exists $(x, y) \in C \times D$ such that $\langle x, y\rangle$ is solvable.

(b) *$R(G)$ membership criteria*

(b1) Guralnick, Kunyavskii, Plotkin and Shalev [20] (2006): an element x is contained in $R(G)$ if and only if $\langle x, y\rangle$ is solvable for all $y \in G$.

(b2) The first author, Flavell, and Guralnick [10] (2010) (and (independently) Gordeev, Grunewald, Kunyavskii, and Plotkin in [12] (2010)): an element x is contained in $R(G)$ if and only if $\langle x, x^{g_1}, x^{g_2}, x^{g_3}\rangle$ is solvable for all $g_1, g_2, g_3 \in G$.

Another perspective from which one can look at these results is, loosely speaking, the complexity of their proofs. Thompson proved his solvability criterion (a1) as a corollary to his classification of the minimal simple groups, while Flavell showed in [9] (1995) that it can be proved using elementary methods. On the other hand, the proofs of (a5) and the $R(G)$ membership criteria in (b) rely on the full classification of finite simple groups. The results of this paper generalize (b1) and are inspired by (a4) (a weaker version of which is obtained as a special case). Our proofs also rely on the classification of finite simple groups.

3. NOTATION AND BACKGROUND RESULTS

3.1. **Notation.**

. In general, we follow the definitions and notation of [14]. In particular, $\mathbb{F}_q$ will denote a finite field with q elements and characteristic r. For a group G of Lie type, Σ will denote the associated root system (of the untwisted group) and Π the corresponding fundamental root system. The Lie rank of G is equal to $|\Pi|$. The lowest root relative to Π will be denoted by α_* (and $-\alpha_*$ denotes the highest root). Let $\widehat{\Pi}$ denote the set of orbits of Π under the associated symmetry of the Dynkin diagram, as in [14, Section 2.3]. When G is untwisted, the associated symmetry is trivial and $\Pi = \widehat{\Pi}$.

If G is an almost simple group, then G_0 will denote its socle (a nonabelian simple group). When G_0 is a simple group of Lie type, $G_0^* = \mathrm{Inndiag}(G_0)$ denotes the group of inner-diagonal automorphisms of G_0.

Many cases in our proofs reduce to checking a small number of relatively small groups G. We indicate the usage of Magma [4] in verifying that G has the desired properties by saying that G belongs to an appropriate computerized verification list (CVL for short), which we define in the text.

3.2. **Background Results.**

3.2.1. *Results for the reduction step.* The results quoted here are used to reduce the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2 to questions about almost simple groups.

Theorem 4. ([15, Theorem A]) *Let G be a finite group and let $x \in G$ be an element of prime order $p \geq 5$. Then $x \in R(G)$ if and only if $\langle x, x^g \rangle$ is solvable for all $g \in G$.*

Theorem 5. ([15, Theorem A*]) *Let G be an almost simple group with socle G_0. Let $x \in G$ have odd prime order p. Then one of the following conditions hold.*
(1) *There exists $g \in G$ such that $\langle x, x^g \rangle$ is not solvable; or*
(2) *$p = 3$ and either*
(i) *$G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}_d^{\varepsilon}(3)$, $\mathrm{PSp}_d(3)$, $\mathrm{P}\Omega_d^{\varepsilon}(3)$, $E_6^{\varepsilon}(3)$, $E_7(3)$, $E_8(3)$, $F_4(3)$, or ${}^3D_4(3)$ and x is a long root element in G_0, or $G_0 \cong G_2(3)$ and x is a long root or short root element in G_0; or*
(ii) *$G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSU}_d(2)$ and $x \in \mathrm{PGU}_d(2)$ has a preimage $x_1 \in \mathrm{GU}_d(2)$ that stabilizes a subspace decomposition $V = V_1 \perp V_{d-1}$, where $\dim V_i = i$, V_1 and V_{d-1} are nondegenerate, x acts trivially on V_{d-1}, and x acts on V_1 by multiplication by $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_4$ of order 3.*

Theorem 6. ([16, Theorem 1.3]) *Suppose that G is an almost simple group. If $x \in G$ has prime order $p \geq 5$, then there exists an involution $y \in G$ such that $\langle x, y \rangle$ is nonsolvable.*

3.2.2. *Results on inner-diagonal automorphisms.* Let G_0 be a simple group of Lie type of characteristic r and let $x \in G_0^*$. Then x is unipotent if it has order a power of r and x is semisimple if it has order prime to r.

Lemma 7. ([21, Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2]) *Let G_0 be a simple group of Lie type with $x \in G_0^*$.*
(a) *If x is unipotent, let P_1 and P_2 be distinct maximal parabolic subgroups of G_0 containing a common Borel subgroup, with unipotent radicals U_1 and U_2. Then x is G_0-conjugate to an element of $P_i \backslash U_i$ for $i = 1$ or $i = 2$.*
(b) *Suppose that x is semisimple and that x is contained in a parabolic subgroup of G_0^*. If the rank of G_0 is at least 2, then there exists a maximal parabolic P with a Levi complement J such that x is G_0^*-conjugate to an element of J not centralized by any Levi component (possibly solvable) of J.*

When G is untwisted, note that Lemma 7(a) can be applied if there are at least two distinct nodes of the Dynkin diagram. These nodes define a pair of distinct maximal parabolic subgroups. Similarly, when G is twisted, Lemma 7(a) can be applied when there are at least two orbits of nodes under the associated symmetry of the Dynkin diagram. The next lemma is useful for applying Lemma 7(b).

Lemma 8. *Let K be a simple group of Lie type of characteristic r, and let $x \in K^*$ have order coprime to r. If $O^{r'}(C_{K^*}(x))$ is nontrivial, then x is contained in a parabolic subgroup of K^*.*

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that x is not contained in any parabolic subgroup of K^*. Let $g \in C_{K^*}(x)$ be a nontrivial r-element. Then, by the Borel–Tits theorem (see [14, Theorem 3.1.3] for example) $N_{K^*}(\langle g \rangle)$ is contained in a parabolic subgroup of K^* and since $x \in N_{K^*}(\langle g \rangle)$ we have a contradiction. □

3.2.3. *Results on field, graph and graph-field automorphisms.* For $A \in \mathrm{GL}_n(q^k)$, define the matrix A^{φ_q} by $(A^{\varphi_q})_{ij} = A_{ij}^q$.

Lemma 9. *(*[13, Section 7.2]*) Let K be a simple group of Lie type and suppose that $\phi \in \mathrm{Aut}(K)$ is either a field or a graph-field automorphism. Suppose that $\phi' \in \mathrm{Aut}(K)$ has the same order as ϕ and that $\phi K^* = \phi' K^*$. Then there exists $y \in K^*$ such that $\phi' = \phi^y$. In particular, ϕ' is a field or a graph-field automorphism.*

The conjugacy of graph automorphisms is more complicated. The next lemma combines results from [30, Lemma 3.7] and [31, Lemma 3.9], which describe representatives of the K^*-classes of graph involutions when $K = \mathrm{PSL}_n^{\varepsilon}(q)$. Here ι denotes the inverse-transpose automorphism of $\mathrm{PSL}_n(q)$.

Lemma 10. *Let $K = \mathrm{PSL}_n^{\varepsilon}(q)$, where $n \geq 3$, and let v be the number of K^*-classes of graph involutions of K (that is, classes of involutions in $K^*\Gamma_K - K^*$ if $\varepsilon = 1$ and classes of involutions in $K^*\Phi_K - K^*$ if $\varepsilon = -1$).*
(i) *If n is odd, then $v = 1$. A representative of the single K^*-class is given by ι if $\varepsilon = 1$, and by φ_q if $\varepsilon = -1$.*
(ii) *If n is even and q is even, then $v = 2$. Representatives of the two K^*-classes are given by ι and ιSt if $\varepsilon = 1$ and by φ_q and $\varphi_q x_0(1)$ if $\varepsilon = -1$. The $n \times n$ matrices S, t and $x_0(1)$ are given by*

$$S = \mathrm{diag}\left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \ldots, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right], \quad t = \mathrm{diag}\left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, 1, \ldots, 1\right],$$

and $x_0(1) = I_n + E^{(1,n)}$ where $(E^{(1,n)})_{ij} = \delta_{i1}\delta_{jn}$.
(iii) *If n is even and q is odd, then $v = 3$. The centralizers in K of the representatives of the three K^*-classes are subgroups of type $\mathrm{Sp}_n(q)$, $O_n^+(q)$ and $O_n^-(q)$ (for both values of ε). If $\varepsilon = 1$, then the representatives of the three K^*-classes are given by ιS, ιS^+, and ιS^-, where*

$$S^+ = \mathrm{diag}\left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \ldots, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right], \quad S^- = \mathrm{diag}\left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \ldots, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \mu, 1\right]$$

are $n \times n$ matrices and $-\mu/2$ is a non-square. For $\varepsilon = -1$, it is shown in [30, Section 3.11.4]*, that there exist three choices of Hermitian form, f_1, f_2, f_3, such that for $\mathrm{GU}_n(q, f_i) = C_{\mathrm{GL}_n(q^2)}(f_i \varphi_q \iota) = X$ and $\mathrm{PSU}_n(q, f_i) = X'/Z(X')$, the actions of φ_q on $\mathrm{PSU}_n(q, f_i)$ represent all three K^*-classes.*

Remark 11. In Lemma 10(ii), if $n = 2m$, $\varepsilon = -1$ and $\{e_1, \ldots, e_m, f_m, \ldots, f_1\}$ is an ordered basis of V, then the Hermitian form is defined by $\langle e_i, e_j \rangle = \langle f_i, f_j \rangle = 0$ and $\langle e_i, f_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$.

Lemma 12. *(*[30, Lemma 3.6]*) Let $K = E_6^{\varepsilon}(q)$ be simple.*
(i) *If $\varepsilon = 1$, then there are precisely two K^*-classes of graph involutions, with representatives γ, $\gamma x_{-\alpha_*}(1)$ if q is even and γ, $\gamma h_{-\alpha_*}(-1)$ if q is odd, where γ is the standard graph automorphism of E_6.*
(ii) *If $\varepsilon = -1$, then there are precisely two K^*-classes of graph involutions with representatives φ_q, $\varphi_q x_{-\alpha_*}(1)$ if q is even and φ_q, $\varphi_q h_{-\alpha_*}(-1)$ if q is odd.*

3.2.4. *Other background results.*

Remark 13. For a prime power q, we recall that u is a primitive prime divisor of $q^e - 1$ if u divides $q^e - 1$ but does not divide $q^i - 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, e-1$. A primitive prime divisor of $q^e - 1$ exists if $e \geq 3$ and $(q, e) \neq (2, 6)$ (see [26, Theorem 5.2.14] for example). Moreover, since $q^e \equiv 1 \pmod{u}$, we have $u - 1 = ke$ for some $k \geq 1$ by Fermat's little theorem. In particular $u \geq e + 1$.

Lemma 14. *Let $K = \mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$ and suppose that $q = q_0^k$ where k is prime. Let x be the automorphism of $\mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$ induced by the field automorphism φ_{q_0} of $\mathrm{GL}_2(q)$.*
(i) *If $k = 2$ and q is odd, then $C_K(x) \cong \mathrm{PGL}_2(q_0)$.*
(ii) *Otherwise (that is, if k is odd or if q is even) we have $C_K(x) \cong \mathrm{PSL}_2(q_0)$.*

Proof. Note that $o(x) = k$ and since $\mathrm{PGL}_2(q) \cong \mathrm{Inndiag}(\mathrm{PSL}_2(q))$ it follows that

$$C_{\mathrm{PGL}_2(q)}(x) \cong \mathrm{Inndiag}(O^{r'}(C_{\mathrm{PSL}_2(q)}(x))) \cong \mathrm{PGL}_2(q_0)$$

(see [14, Proposition 4.9.1] for example). Now $C_K(x) = K \cap C_{\mathrm{PGL}_2(q)}(x)$ and we use [26, Proposition 4.5.3] in order to obtain the precise structure of $K \cap C_{\mathrm{PGL}_2(q)}(x)$. □

Lemma 15. *Let G be a finite group, let $x \in \mathrm{Aut}(G)$ have prime power order p^α, and let $M = C_G(x)$. Suppose that p divides $|G : M|$, and that either $M = N_G(M)$ or $Z(M) = 1$. Then there exists a conjugate of M that is normalized but not centralized by x.*

Proof. By our assumptions, p divides the number of fixed points of the action of $\langle x\rangle$ on the set of right cosets of M in G via $(Mg)^x = Mg^x$. Since M is a fixed point for this action there exists $g \in G - M$ such that $(Mg)^x = Mg^x = Mg$. It follows that $g^x = m_0 g$ for some $m_0 \in M$. We have

$$(M^g)^x = (M^x)^{g^x} = (M)^{g^x} = M^{m_0 g} = M^g,$$

and thus x normalizes M^g. Assume for a contradiction that x centralizes M^g. Then $M^g \leq M$ implying that $M^g = M$. Thus we may assume that M is not self-normalizing in G ($g \in G - M$), and therefore we may assume that $Z(M) = 1$. Hence, for every $m \in M$, we have $m^g = m^{g^x}$, and therefore $g^x g^{-1} = m_0 \in Z(M)$ and $m_0 = 1$. But $g^x \neq g$ since $g \in G - M$, which is a contradiction. □

4. Reduction to the almost simple case

The first step in proving Theorems 1 and 2 is to reduce the proof to a question about almost simple groups. In the following, $F(G)$ denotes the Fitting subgroup of G, $F^*(G) = F(G)E(G)$ denotes the generalized Fitting subgroup of G, where $E(G)$ is the layer, and $soc(G)$ is the product of all minimal normal subgroups of G. Note that if $R(G) = 1$, then $F(G) = 1$ and $F^*(G) = E(G) = soc(G)$ where, in this case, $soc(G)$ is a direct product of simple, nonabelian groups. Each of these simple groups is referred to as a *component* of G. Furthermore, since $F^*(G) = soc(G)$ has a trivial centre, and since $C_G(F^*(G)) \leq F^*(G)$ (see [2, (31.13)] for example), we have $C_G(F^*(G)) = 1$, and hence G acts on $F^*(G)$ by conjugation as a group of automorphisms embedded in $\mathrm{Aut}(F^*(G))$.

4.1. **Reduction of Theorem 1 to the almost simple case.**

Lemma 16. *Let G be a finite group such that $F(G) = 1$. Let $x \in G$ and let L be a component of G such that $x \notin N_G(L)$. Then there exist an odd prime p and a p-element $y \in G$ such that $\langle x, y\rangle$ is not solvable.*

Proof. Suppose that the claim is false and let G be a minimal counterexample. Consider $\{L^{x^i} \mid i = 0, 1 \dots\}$, which is the orbit of L under the conjugation action of $\langle x\rangle$. For each $z \in \langle x\rangle$, we have either $L \cap L^z = 1$ and $[L, L^z] = 1$, or $L^z = L$. Let $t = |\{L^{x^i} \mid i = 0, 1 \dots\}|$ and note that $t \geq 2$ since $x \notin N_G(L)$. Consider $H = \langle x, L\rangle$ and note that $x \notin R(H)$. Indeed, if $x \in R(H)$, then on the one hand, $[x, l] \in R(H)$ for all $l \in L$. On the other hand, we have $[x, l] \in L \times L^x$, thus $[x, l] \in R(H) \cap (L \times L^x) = \{1\}$ for all $l \in L$, which contradicts our assumption that $x \notin N_G(L)$. Since $x \notin R(H)$, the group $H/R(H)$ satisfies the assumptions of the lemma, so, by minimality of G, we may assume that $G = H = \langle x, L\rangle$ and $R(G) = 1$.

We have $F^*(G) = soc(G) = L_0 \times L_1 \times \cdots L_{t-1}$ where each $L_i = L^{x^j}$ for some integer j and we may assume that $L_0 = L$. Now $\mathrm{Aut}(F^*(G)) \cong (\mathrm{Aut}(L))^t \rtimes S_t$ and since $F(G) = 1$, we can identify G with a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(F^*(G))$ and write $x = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_t)\tau$ where $\sigma_i \in \mathrm{Aut}(L_{i-1})$ and $\tau \in S_t$ is a t-cycle. By relabelling the L_i if necessary we may assume that $\tau = (1, 2, \dots, t)$, and $\tau^{-1}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_t)\tau = (\sigma_t, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{t-1})$. By Theorem 5, there exist $l_1, l_2 \in L$ of prime order

$p \geq 5$ such that $\langle l_1, l_2 \rangle$ is not solvable. Let $y = (l_1, 1, \ldots, 1, l_2^{\sigma_t^{-1}}) \in G$. Then y has order p and

$$x^{-1}yx = \tau^{-1}(\sigma_1^{-1}, \ldots, \sigma_t^{-1})(l_1, 1, \ldots, 1, l_2^{\sigma_t^{-1}})(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_t)\tau =$$
$$= \tau^{-1}(l_1^{\sigma_1}, 1, \ldots, 1, l_2^{\sigma_t^{-1}\sigma_t})\tau = (l_2, \ldots,).$$

Now let $\pi_1 : G \to L_0$ be the projection homomorphism onto L_0. Then $\pi_1(\langle y^x, y \rangle)$ contains a copy of $\langle l_1, l_2 \rangle$, hence $\langle x, y \rangle$ is not solvable. □

Lemma 17. *If G is a minimal counterexample to Theorem 1, then G is almost simple. In particular, if Theorem 1 holds for almost simple groups, then it holds for all finite groups.*

Proof. Let G be a minimal counterexample to Theorem 1. We will show that G is an almost simple group. By assumption there exists $x \in G - R(G)$ such that for every odd prime p, $\langle x, y \rangle$ is solvable for all p-elements $y \in G$.

Suppose that $R(G)$ is nontrivial. Set $\overline{G} = G/R(G)$ and note that $|\overline{G}| < |G|$. On the one hand, $\overline{x} = xR(G) \notin R(\overline{G})$ (which is trivial) because $x \notin R(G)$. On the other hand, $\langle \overline{x}, \overline{y} \rangle$ is solvable for all p-elements $\overline{y} \in \overline{G}$, for all odd primes p. This implies, by minimality of G, that $\overline{x} \in R(\overline{G})$. Thus we have a contradiction.

So we may assume that $R(G) = F(G) = 1$. Since $x \notin R(G)$ we know that G is nonsolvable and G has at least one component L. If $x \notin N_G(L)$, then we can apply Lemma 16. Therefore we may assume that $x \in N_G(L)$ for each component L of G. Since $C_G(F^*(G)) = 1$, there exists a component L of G on which $\langle x \rangle$ acts nontrivially. Let $\langle x^d \rangle$ be the kernel of this action. If $x^d \neq 1$, then (G, x^d) is also a minimal counterexample and so we may assume without loss of generality that $x^d = 1$ and therefore that $\langle x \rangle$ acts faithfully on L. In particular, $\langle x, L \rangle$ embeds in $\mathrm{Aut}(L)$ and since G is a minimal counterexample, we have $G = \langle x, L \rangle$. Therefore $L \trianglelefteq G \leq \mathrm{Aut}(L)$ and G is almost simple. □

Remark 18. Lemma 17 shows that in order to prove Theorem 1, it suffices to prove that for all almost simple groups G and for all nontrivial $x \in G$, there exist an odd prime p and a p-element $y \in G$ such that $\langle x, y \rangle$ is nonsolvable. In fact, since $\langle x^k, y \rangle$ being nonsolvable implies that $\langle x, y \rangle$ is nonsolvable, it suffices to check all $x \in G$ of prime order.

Lemma 19. *Let G be an almost simple group and let $x \in G$ of prime order $u \geq 5$. Then there exists an odd prime p and a p-element $y \in G$ such that $\langle x, y \rangle$ is not solvable.*

Proof. By Theorem 5 there exists $g \in G$ such that $\langle x, x^g \rangle$ is not solvable. Hence, taking $p = u$ and $y = x^g$, $\langle x, y \rangle$ is not solvable. □

Combining Lemma 17, Remark 18 and Lemma 19, it is clear that Theorem 1 will follow from the next theorem.

Theorem 20. *Let G be an almost simple group. If $x \in G$ has order 2 or 3, then there exist an odd prime p and a p-element y for which $\langle x, y \rangle$ is not solvable.*

4.2. **Reduction of Theorem 2 to the almost simple case.** Let G be a minimal counterexample to Theorem 2, so that G contains a p-element x (p odd) such that $x \notin R(G)$ and $\langle x, y \rangle$ is solvable for all 2-elements y. Since G is a minimal counterexample, $R(G)$ must be trivial. We therefore may as well assume that x has order p.

Let L be a component of G. First suppose that $x \notin N_G(L)$. Then as in the proof of Lemma 16, we may assume that $G = \langle x, L \rangle = L^p \langle x \rangle \leq \mathrm{Aut}(L) \rtimes S_p$. So $x = (\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_p)\tau$, where $\sigma_i \in \mathrm{Aut}(L)$ and $\tau \in S_p$ is a p-cycle. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\tau = (1, 2, \ldots, p)$ and moreover, conjugating by a suitable $(u_1, \ldots, u_p) \in \mathrm{Aut}(L)^p$ we may assume that $x = (\sigma, 1, \ldots, 1)(1, 2, \ldots, p)$. Furthermore, since $x^p = (\sigma, \sigma, \cdots, \sigma) = 1$, we have $\sigma = 1$ and $x = (1, 2, \ldots, p)$. Now, by [34, Theorem A], there exist three involutions in L that generate L unless $L = \mathrm{PSU}_3(3)$, in which case it is easily verified that there exist three 2-elements in L that generate L. So let $y = (y_1, 1, \ldots, 1, y_2, y_3) \in L^p \leq G$ where the y_i are 2-elements such that $L = \langle y_1, y_2, y_3 \rangle$. Then y is a 2-element of G and $y = (y_1, 1, \ldots, 1, y_2, y_3)$,

$y^x = (y_3, y_1, 1, \dots, 1, y_2)$ and $y^{x^2} = (y_2, y_3, y_1, 1, \dots, 1)$ are all contained in $\langle x, y\rangle$. These three elements generate a subgroup of $\langle x, y\rangle$ whose projection onto the first component of L^p contains $\langle y_1, y_2, y_3\rangle = L$, which is not solvable. Thus, assuming that $x \notin N_G(L)$ leads to a contradiction, so we conclude that $x \in N_G(L)$. Now arguing as in the proof of Lemma 17 shows that G is almost simple. Moreover, Theorem 6 implies that $p = 3$ and it therefore remains to prove the following.

Theorem 21. *Let G be an almost simple group and let $x \in G$ of order 3. Then there exists a 2-element $y \in G$ such that $\langle x, y\rangle$ is not solvable.*

5. Proofs for the almost simple case

5.1. **Proof of Theorem 20.**

5.1.1. *The case $o(x) = 3$ of Theorem 20 .* In this section, we prove that if G is almost simple and $x \in G$ has order 3, then there exist an odd prime p and a p-element $y \in G$ such that $\langle x, y\rangle$ is not solvable.

Definition 22. *The list $CVL1$ consists of the following groups: $G_2(3)$, $\mathrm{PSL}_3(3)$, $\mathrm{PSp}_4(3)$ and $\mathrm{PSU}_3(3)$. For every $G_0 \in CVL1$ we have verified, using* Magma, *that if $x \in \mathrm{Aut}(G_0)$ has order 3, then there exist an odd prime p and a p-element $y \in G_0$ for which $\langle x, y\rangle$ is not solvable.*

Proof of Theorem 20 for $o(x) = 3$. By Theorem 5, we can either take $p = 3$ and y some conjugate of x, or we may assume that Theorem 5(2) holds. In the latter case, we show that we can reduce to the case of $\mathrm{PSL}_3(3)$, $\mathrm{PSp}_4(3)$ or $\mathrm{PSU}_3(3)$, all of which are contained in $CVL1$. We split the discussion into the following cases:

1. The socle G_0 is one of the exceptions listed in Theorem 5(2)(i), and x is a long root element in G_0. Since $G_2(3) \in CVL1$ we may assume that $G \neq G_2(3)$. By minimality we have $G = G_0$. The Dynkin diagram of G has $n \geq 2$ nodes. In all cases the long root elements of G form a single G_0^*-conjugacy class of G_0^* (see [14, Example 3.2.6]), and thus we may assume $x = x_{-\alpha_*}(1)$. Now we use subsystem subgroups (see [14, Section 2.6] for example) to find a suitable subgroup A, which will yield one of the groups in $CVL1$. Let s be a fundamental root adjacent to α_* in the extended Dynkin diagram. We define a subsystem Σ_0 of Σ with respect to G ([14, Definition 2.6.1]). There are two possibilities.

a. $G \neq {}^2A_n(3)$. Choose Σ_0 to be the intersection of the $\mathbb{Z}$-span of $\{\alpha_*, s\}$ and Σ. Then Σ_0 is of type A_2 or C_2, and taking $w = 1$ in [14, Definition 2.6.1], it follows that that $A = \langle x_{\alpha_*}(1), x_{-\alpha_*}(1), x_s(1), x_{-s}(1)\rangle$ is a subgroup of G isomorphic to either $A_2(3)$ or $C_2(3)$.

b. $G = {}^2A_n(3)$. For $n = 2$ take $A = G$. For $n \geq 3$, let

$$A = \langle x_{\alpha_*}(1), x_{-\alpha_*}(1), x_{-\alpha_1}(1)x_{-\alpha_n}(1), x_{\alpha_1}(1)x_{\alpha_n}(1)\rangle$$

and note that $A \cong C_2(3)$ contains x.

Thus, in either case, the image of x in $A/Z(A)$ is nontrivial and $A/Z(A)$ is one of $\mathrm{PSL}_3(3)$, $\mathrm{PSp}_4(3)$, $\mathrm{PSU}_3(3)$; these groups are contained in $CVL1$.

2. $G = \mathrm{PGU}_d(2)$, where $d \geq 4$, and x is the image of $x_1 \in \mathrm{GU}_d(2)$ as described in Theorem 5(2)(ii). Clearly x_1 stabilizes a subspace decomposition $V = V_4 \perp V_{d-4}$, with x_1 acting noncentrally on a nondegenerate 4-dimensional subspace V_4. So $x_1 \in \mathrm{GU}_4(2)$. Therefore we can reduce to the case of $G_0 = \mathrm{PSU}_4(2)$, and $\mathrm{PSU}_4(2) \cong \mathrm{PSp}_4(3)$ is contained in $CVL1$. □

5.1.2. *The proof of Theorem 20 for involutions.* In this section, (G, x) is a minimal counterexample to the claim of Theorem 20 when x is an involution. Thus G is almost simple and $\langle x, y\rangle$ is solvable for every p-element $y \in G$ for every odd prime p.

Definition 23. *The list $CVL2$ consists of the following groups: A_6, $\mathrm{PSL}_3(2)$, $\mathrm{PSU}_4(2)$, $\mathrm{PSU}_5(2)$, ${}^3D_4(2)$, $\mathrm{PSL}_3(3)$, $\mathrm{PSL}_4(3)$, $\mathrm{P\Omega}_7(3)$, $\mathrm{PSp}_4(3)$, $\mathrm{PSp}_6(3)$, $G_2(3)$, $\mathrm{PSU}_4(3)$, ${}^2D_4(3)$, $\mathrm{PSU}_3(3)$, $\mathrm{P\Omega}_8^{\pm}(2)$, $\mathrm{P\Omega}_8^{\pm}(3)$, $F_4(2)$, ${}^2F_4(2)'$. For each $G_0 \in CVL2$, we have verified using*

MAGMA *that if $x \in \mathrm{Aut}(G_0)$ has order 2, then there exist an odd prime p and a p-element $y \in G_0$ for which $\langle x, y\rangle$ is not solvable.*

Lemma 24. *If (G, x) is a minimal counterexample to Theorem 20, then G has more than one $\mathrm{Aut}(G_0)$-conjugacy class of involutions.*

Proof. Suppose that G has only one $\mathrm{Aut}(G_0)$-conjugacy class of involutions. Pick $z \in G_0$ of prime order $p \geq 5$. By Theorem 6, there exists an involution $y \in G_0$ such that $\langle z, y\rangle$ is nonsolvable. But $y^w = x$ for some $w \in \mathrm{Aut}(G_0)$ and so $\langle x, z^{w^{-1}}\rangle \cong \langle y, z\rangle$ is nonsolvable. □

Proof of Theorem 20 for x an involution. We split the discussion according to the isomorphism type of G_0.

(A) $G_0 \cong A_n$, $n \geq 5$. Since all odd p-elements of $\mathrm{Aut}(A_n)$ are in A_n it is sufficient to prove the claim for $G = \mathrm{Aut}(A_n)$. Since $A_6 \in CVL2$ we have $n \neq 6$, and hence $G = S_n$. Considering representatives of distinct conjugacy classes of involutions in G, we may assume that $x = (1, 2)$, $(1, 2)(3, 4)$ or $(1, 2)(3, 4)(5, 6)\sigma$ where $\sigma \in \mathrm{Sym}\{7, \dots, n\}$ satisfies $\sigma^2 = 1$. Let $y = (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) \in G$. In all cases, $\langle x, y\rangle$ contains $\mathrm{Alt}\{1, \dots, 5\}$, which is not solvable, and we have a contradiction.

(B) *Simple groups of Lie type of characteristic r*

(B.1) $x \in G_0^* = \mathrm{Inndiag}(G_0)$. We split the analysis according to whether x is unipotent ($r = 2$) or semisimple ($r > 2$).

(B.1.1) *Unipotent involutions ($r = 2$).* We have $x \in G_0$ since $|\mathrm{Outdiag}(G_0)|$ is not divisible by r [14, Theorem 2.5.12(c)], and so $G = G_0$ by minimality. Suppose that $|\hat{\Pi}| > 1$. By Lemma 7 and the discussion following it, we may assume that $x \in P\backslash U$ where P is a standard maximal parabolic subgroup of G_0 and U is its nontrivial unipotent radical. Since $x \in P\backslash U$, the image $\overline{x}$ of x in $P/U \cong L = MH$ is nontrivial, H is the Cartan subgroup and M is a central product of groups of Lie type of characteristic 2 corresponding to the Dynkin diagram of G_0 with one node deleted (see [14, Theorem 2.6.5]). Since x has order $r = 2$ we have $\overline{x} \in M$ and one of the groups M_0 in the central product is normalized but not centralized by $\overline{x}$. Set $A = \langle\overline{x}\rangle M_0$. We note that $|A| < |G_0|$ since $A \leq L \lneqq G_0$. If all components of M are nonsolvable, then so is M_0, hence $A/Z(A)$ is almost simple, and the image x_1 of $\overline{x}$ in $A/Z(A)$ is nontrivial. Thus (G, x) cannot be a minimal counterexample.

The groups G_0 that are not eliminated by the last argument satisfy either (i) $|\hat{\Pi}| = 1$, or (ii) for every pair of distinct maximal parabolic subgroups of G_0 containing a common Borel subgroup, at least one of the two parabolics has a Levi complement with a solvable component. In case (ii), the solvable component is of type $A_1(2)$, ${}^2A_2(2)$ or ${}^2B_2(2)$ (see [14, Theorem 2.2.7]). It is straightforward, using [14, Proposition 2.6.2 and Theorem 2.6.5] for example, to obtain the list of G_0 satisfying (ii). The list of groups G_0 satisfying (i) or (ii) consists of $\mathrm{PSL}_2(2^a)$ ($a \geq 2$), $\mathrm{PSU}_3(2^a)$ ($a \geq 2$), ${}^2B_2(2^a)$ ($a \geq 3$ odd), $\mathrm{PSL}_3(2)$, $\mathrm{PSU}_4(2)$, $\mathrm{PSU}_5(2)$ and ${}^3D_4(2)$. We consider the groups on this list.

We note that $\mathrm{PSL}_2(2^a)$ and $\mathrm{PSU}_3(2^a)$ have a single class of involutions (transvections) (see [14, p. 103] for example). The same is true for ${}^2B_2(2^a)$ by [36, Proposition 8]. So (G, x) cannot be a minimal counterexample in all these cases by Lemma 24. The remaining groups $\mathrm{PSL}_3(2)$, $\mathrm{PSU}_4(2)$, $\mathrm{PSU}_5(2)$, ${}^3D_4(2)$ all belong to $CVL2$.

(B.1.2) *Semisimple involutions.* Suppose that $r > 2$, and so x is semisimple and suppose that $|\hat{\Pi}| > 1$. Since $O^{r'}(C_{G^*}(x))$ is nontrivial (see [14, Table 4.5.1]), x belongs to a maximal parabolic subgroup of G_0^* by Lemma 8. By Lemma 7(b), x is G_0^*-conjugate to an element z that acts noncentrally on each component of the Levi complement of some maximal parabolic subgroup P^* of G_0^*. Without loss, we may assume that $x = z$ and therefore x acts noncentrally on each component of the Levi complement of the maximal parabolic $P^* \cap G$ of G. If one of the components M_0 is nonsolvable, then we can find $A < G$ and x_1 such that $(A/Z(A), x_1)$ contradicts the minimality of (G, x) as in (B.1.1). The list of groups G_0 with $|\hat{\Pi}| > 1$ and a maximal parabolic subgroup whose components are all solvable or with $|\hat{\Pi}| = 1$

consists of $\mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$ ($q \geq 5$ odd), $\mathrm{PSU}_3(q)$ ($q \geq 3$ odd), ${}^2G_2(3^a)$, ${}^3D_4(3)$, $\mathrm{PSL}_3(3)$, $\mathrm{PSL}_4(3)$, $\mathrm{P\Omega}_7(3)$, $\mathrm{PSp}_4(3)$, $\mathrm{PSp}_6(3)$, $\mathrm{P\Omega}_8^+(3)$, $G_2(3)$, $\mathrm{PSU}_4(3)$, $\mathrm{P\Omega}_8^-(3)$.

(B.1.2.1) $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$, $q = r^a \geq 5$ odd. Recall that $|G_0| = q(q^2-1)/2$ and we have $G = \langle G_0, x\rangle = \mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$ or $\mathrm{PGL}_2(q)$. By [14, Table 4.5.1], we have $|C_{G_0^*}(x)| \leq 2(q+1)$ and by [14, Theorem 4.2.2(j)], we have $x^G = x^{G_0^*}$ and $|x^G| \geq |G_0^*|/2(q+1) = q(q-1)/2$. Let $y \in G_0$ be a p-element where p is an odd prime to be specified, and M a maximal subgroup of G containing y. Using the lists of maximal subgroups of $\mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$ and $\mathrm{PGL}_2(q)$ (see [11, Theorems 2.2 (Dickson) and 3.5]), we have two cases to consider:

(B.1.2.1.1) $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}_2(r)$ (that is, $a = 1$ and $q = r$). For $q = 5$ we have $G_0 = \mathrm{PSL}_2(5) \cong A_5$, which has been eliminated in (A). Hence we may assume that $q \geq 7$. Choose $p = r$. Then M must be a Frobenius group of order $q(q-1)/2$ for $G = \mathrm{PSL}_2(r)$ and of order $q(q-1)$ for $G = \mathrm{PGL}_2(r)$, where $\langle y\rangle$ is the normal Frobenius kernel of order q. Any involution in M must be the unique involution in one of the cyclic Frobenius complements, and so M has q involutions. Since $|x^G| \geq q(q-1)/2$, there is a conjugate x_1 of x that does not normalize M. Moreover, let $g \in G$ be such that $M^g \neq M$. We claim that $y \notin M^g$. Note that $M = N_G(\langle y\rangle)$ (otherwise $\langle y\rangle \trianglelefteq G$ hence $\langle y\rangle \trianglelefteq G_0$, which is a contradiction since G_0 is simple). If $y \in M^g$, then $\langle y\rangle$ coincides with the unique normal subgroup of M^g of order q and hence $M^g = N_G(\langle y\rangle) = M$, which is a contradiction. Thus $y^{x_1} \notin M$, and $\langle y, y^{x_1}\rangle \leq G_0$ is not contained in M or any of its conjugates. It follows that $\langle y, y^{x_1}\rangle = G_0$. This implies that $\langle x_1, y\rangle$ is nonsolvable, which is a contradiction.

(B.1.2.1.2) $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}_2(r^a)$, $a \geq 2$. Choose p to be a primitive prime divisor of $r^{2a}-1$ (see Remark 13). Then $p \geq 5$, and p divides $q+1$. Hence M is either a dihedral group of order $q+1$ if $G = \mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$ or order $2(q+1)$ if $G = \mathrm{PGL}_2(q)$ or an A_5 (if $p = 5$). If M is dihedral, then y belongs to the unique cyclic subgroup $C \leq M$ of index 2, and $M = N_G(C) = N_G(\langle y\rangle)$. Therefore, if $M_1 \neq M$ is also a maximal dihedral group of G of the same order, then it does not contain y. Also, since $|x^G| \geq q(q-1)/2$ and $q \geq 9$ we have $|x^G| \geq |M|$ and there is a conjugate x_1 of x such that $\langle y, y^{x_1}\rangle$ is not contained in M or any of its conjugates. Suppose that $\langle y, y^{x_1}\rangle$ is contained in a maximal subgroup of G_0 that is isomorphic to A_5. Then either $\langle y, y^{x_1}\rangle = \langle y\rangle$, contradicting the fact that $\langle y, y^{x_1}\rangle \nleq M$, or $\langle y, y^{x_1}\rangle \cong A_5$, which is nonsolvable. Otherwise $\langle y, y^{x_1}\rangle = G_0$. Thus, in all cases, $\langle x_1, y\rangle$ is nonsolvable, which is a contradiction.

(B.1.2.2) $G_0 \cong {}^2G_2(3^a)$, ${}^3D_4(3)$ or $\mathrm{PSU}_3(q)$ ($q \geq 3$ odd). Here there is a unique class of involutions (see [14, Table 4.5.1] for example) and Lemma 24 eliminates these cases.

(B.1.2.3) The remaining possibilities for G_0 are $\mathrm{PSL}_3(3)$, $\mathrm{PSL}_4(3)$, $\mathrm{P\Omega}_7(3)$, $\mathrm{PSp}_4(3)$, $\mathrm{PSp}_6(3)$, $\mathrm{P\Omega}_8^+(3)$, $G_2(3)$, $\mathrm{PSU}_4(3)$, or $\mathrm{P\Omega}_8^-(3)$. These groups are contained in $CVL2$.

(B.2) *Field involutions.*
Suppose that x belongs to a G_0^*-coset of $\mathrm{Aut}(G_0)$ represented by a field automorphism. By Lemma 9 we may assume that x is a standard field automorphism of G_0. Since x is induced by an order 2 automorphism of $\mathbb{F}_{r^a}$, a must be even and $r^a \geq 4$.

Note that G_0 is not a Suzuki–Ree group, since if it were, then $\mathrm{Out}(G_0)$ would have odd order. If G_0 is a Steinberg group ${}^d\Sigma(q)$, then d and $o(x) = 2$ must be coprime, thus leaving $G_0 \cong {}^3D_4(q)$ as the only possibility. Now ${}^3D_4(q)$ and all the simple untwisted groups of Lie type, except $A_1(q)$, have a proper subgroup $A \cong \mathrm{SL}_2(q)$ generated by root subgroups of G_0 ([14, Theorem 3.2.8]). So we may assume that A is normalized by x, and $C_A(x) \cong \mathrm{SL}_2(q^{1/2})$, and in particular, x does not centralize A. Hence, by minimality of (G, x), we have $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$. Let $M = C_{G_0}(x)$. By Lemma 14, we have $M \cong \mathrm{PGL}_2(q^{1/2})$. We can view $x \in \mathrm{Aut}(G_0)$ as an automorphism of $\mathrm{PGL}_2(q) \cong G_0^* \trianglelefteq \mathrm{Aut}(G_0)$. Since $|\mathrm{PGL}_2(q) : M|$ is even and $\mathrm{PGL}_2(q))$ has trivial centre, there exists $g \in \mathrm{PGL}_2(q)\backslash M$ such that x normalizes but does not centralize M^g by Lemma 15. Hence, the pair (M^g, x) contradicts the minimality of (G, x) for $q^{1/2} \geq 4$. Otherwise, $G_0 = \mathrm{PSL}_2(4) \cong A_5$, or $G_0 = \mathrm{PSL}_2(9) \cong A_6$, which are contained in case (A).

(B.3) *Graph involutions.*
Suppose that x belongs to a G_0^*-coset of $\mathrm{Aut}(G_0)$ represented by a graph automorphism. By

our conventions (see [14, Definition 2.5.13]), there are no graph automorphisms of $F_4(2^a)$, $G_2(3^a)$, $B_2(2^a)$, or of the Suzuki–Ree groups. This leaves us with $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}_n^{\varepsilon}(q)$ $(n \geq 3)$, $G_0 \cong E_6^{\varepsilon}(q)$, and $G_0 \cong D_n^{\varepsilon}(q)$ $(n \geq 4)$.

(B.3.1) $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}_n^{\varepsilon}(q)$, where $n \geq 3$.

(B.3.1.1) $n \geq 5$. We split the discussion according to the different cases of Lemma 10.

(i) If n is odd, then both ι $(\varepsilon = 1)$ and φ_q $(\varepsilon = -1)$ normalize but do not centralize a type $\mathrm{PSL}_{n-1}^{\varepsilon}(q)$ subgroup, and (G, x) cannot be a minimal counterexample.

(ii) If n is even $(n \geq 6)$ and q is even, then ι $(\varepsilon = 1)$, φ_q and $\varphi_q x_0(1)$ $(\varepsilon = -1)$, normalize but do not centralize a type $\mathrm{PSL}_{n-1}^{\varepsilon}(q)$ subgroup, while for $x = \iota St$ $(\varepsilon = 1)$, x normalizes and doesn't centralize a type $\mathrm{PSL}_{n-2}(q)$ subgroup.

(iii) If n is even $(n \geq 6)$ and q is odd, then, for $\varepsilon = 1$, x normalizes but does not centralize a type $\mathrm{PSL}_{n-2}(q)$ subgroup in all three cases. For $\varepsilon = -1$, $x = \varphi_q$ acts nontrivially on a type $\mathrm{PSU}_{n-1}(q)$ subgroup in all three cases.

(B.3.1.2) $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}_4^{\varepsilon}(q)$. If q is even, then we can repeat the argument of (B.3.1.1)(ii), unless $q = 2$, $\varepsilon = +$ and $x = \iota St$. But then $\mathrm{PSL}_4(2) \cong A_8$ and we have eliminated this case already. If q is odd, then the discussion of (B.3.1.1)(iii) applies for $\varepsilon = -1$. For $\varepsilon = 1$, ιS^+ and ιS^- normalize the subgroup $\{\mathrm{diag}[A, 1, 1] \mid A \in \mathrm{GL}_2(q)\} \leq \mathrm{GL}_4(q)$. Moreover, ιS^+ and ιS^- restrict to ιS_0 where

$$S_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

A straightforward calculation shows that ιS_0 coincides with an involution in $\mathrm{PGL}_2(q)$, hence $(\mathrm{PSL}_2(q), \iota S_0)$ contradicts the minimality of (G, x) unless $q = 3$, in which case $\mathrm{PSL}_4(3) \in CVL2$. In summary, if $n = 4$, then it remains to check the claim for $G_0 = \mathrm{PSL}_4(q)$, q odd and $x = \iota S$.

(B.3.1.2.1) $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}_4(q)$, $q \equiv 1 \pmod 4$, $x = \iota S$. First we determine $C_{\mathrm{PGL}_4(q)}(\iota S)$. Let $A \in \mathrm{PGL}_4(q)$. Then $A \in C_{\mathrm{PGL}_4(q)}(\iota S)$ if and only if $A^{\iota S} = cA$ for some scalar c. One checks that this is equivalent to $AS^{-1}A^T = c^{-1}S^{-1}$, and since S^{-1} is the matrix of an alternating form, we have $A \in C_{\mathrm{PGL}_4(q)}(\iota S)$ if and only if $A \in \mathrm{PGSp}_4(q)$, hence $C_{\mathrm{PGL}_4(q)}(\iota S) \cong \mathrm{PGSp}_4(q)$. Now consider $C_{G_0}(\iota S) = G_0 \cap C_{\mathrm{PGL}_4(q)}(\iota S)$. If $C_{G_0}(\iota S) = C_{\mathrm{PGL}_4(q)}(\iota S)$, then $\mathrm{PSL}_4(q)$ contains $\mathrm{PGSp}_4(q)$, which is inconsistent with our assumption that $q \equiv 1 \pmod 4$ (see [28] for example). Moreover, the fact that $q \equiv 1 \pmod 4$ implies that G_0 has index 4 in $\mathrm{PGL}_4(q)$. Let $K = C_{\mathrm{PGL}_4(q)}(\iota S) \cong \mathrm{PGSp}_4(q)$. Using the second isomorphism theorem, we have $|G_0K : G_0| = |K : K \cap G_0| \in \{2, 4\}$. Since K is almost simple with socle $\mathrm{PSp}_4(q)$ of index 2, $|K : K \cap G_0| = 2$, which implies that $C_{G_0}(\iota S) = \mathrm{PSp}_4(q)$. Since $\mathrm{PSp}_4(q)$ has trivial centre and $|\mathrm{PSL}_4(q) : \mathrm{PSp}_4(q)|$ is even, we obtain a contradiction by Lemma 15.

(B.3.1.2.2) $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}_4(q)$, $q \equiv 3 \pmod 4$, $x = \iota S$. Note that $q = r^f$ is not a square, and hence f is odd. Let u be a primitive prime divisor of $r^{3f} - 1$. By Remark 13 and [19, Lemma 2.1], either we can take $u \geq 3e + 1$ (where $e = 3f$), or $u = 2e + 1$ and u^2 divides $q^3 - 1$ (note that since f is odd, $e + 1$ is even and therefore $e + 1$ cannot be prime). Let $y \in G_0$ of order u or u^2 in each case respectively. We will show that $\langle x, y\rangle = \langle G_0, x\rangle$. Suppose to the contrary that $\langle x, y\rangle \leq M < \langle G_0, x\rangle$ for some maximal subgroup M of $\langle G_0, x\rangle$. Let $M_0 = M \cap G_0$. First suppose that M_0 is reducible and hence (since graph automorphisms are present) of type P_2, $P_{1,3}$ or $\mathrm{GL}_1(q) \oplus \mathrm{GL}_3(q)$. But the order of y does not divide $|P_2|$ or $|P_{1,3}|$ and if x normalizes a subgroup of type $\mathrm{GL}_1(q) \oplus \mathrm{GL}_3(q)$, then we can reduce to the case $G_0 = \mathrm{PSL}_3(q)$, which contradicts minimality. So we may assume that M_0 is irreducible and now [19, Theorem 2.2] shows that there are no such maximal subgroups containing both x and y. It now follows that $\langle x, y\rangle = \langle x, G_0\rangle$ as claimed.

(B.3.1.3) $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}_3^{\varepsilon}(q)$. By Lemma 10 we may assume $x = \iota$ when $\varepsilon = +$ and $x = \varphi_q$ when $\varepsilon = -$. First suppose that $\varepsilon = +$. We claim that $C_{G_0}(\iota) = \mathrm{PSO}_3(q)(\cong \mathrm{SO}_3(q))$. To see this, let $g \in C_{G_0}(\iota)$ and write $g = AZ(\mathrm{SL}_3(q))$ for some $A \in \mathrm{SL}_3(q)$. Now since $\iota(g) = g$, we have $\iota(A) = \lambda A$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_q$ such that $\lambda^3 = 1$. But $\lambda^3 = 1$ implies that $\lambda = (\lambda^{-1})^2$ and so for $B = \lambda^{-1}A \in \mathrm{SL}_3(q)$ it follows that $g = BZ(\mathrm{SL}_3(q))$ and $\iota(B) = B$. That is, $B \in \mathrm{SO}_3(q)$ and since $Z(\mathrm{SL}_3(q)) \cap \mathrm{SO}_3(q) = \{1\}$, we have $C_{\mathrm{PSL}_3(q)}(\iota) = \mathrm{SO}_3(q)$. Now suppose that $\varepsilon = -$. Let $g \in C_{G_0}(\varphi_q)$. Then $g = AZ(\mathrm{SU}_3(q))$ where $A \in \mathrm{SU}_3(q)$ (in particular we may assume that $\varphi_q(A) = \iota(A)$). Since $\varphi_q(g) = g$, we have $\varphi_q(A) = \lambda A$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_{q^2}$ such that $\lambda^3 = 1$. As before, $\lambda^3 = 1$ implies that λ has a square root so we can choose A such that $\varphi_q(A) = A$. But $\varphi_q(A) = \iota(A)$, hence $A = \iota(A)$ and $A \in \mathrm{SO}_3(q)$. Finally, $\mathrm{SU}_3(q)$ contains $\mathrm{SO}_3(q)$ as a subfield subgroup, so since $Z(\mathrm{SU}_3(q)) \cap \mathrm{SO}_3(q) = \{1\}$, we have $C_{G_0}(\varphi_q) = \mathrm{SO}_3(q)$. Since $|G_0 : \mathrm{SO}_3(q)|$ is even for all q and ε, and since $Z(\mathrm{SO}_3(q)) = 1$, it follows from Lemma 15 that x normalizes but does not centralize a subgroup $M \cong \mathrm{SO}_3(q)$, which is almost simple for $q \geq 4$. So we may assume that $q \leq 3$, in which case G_0 is isomorphic to $\mathrm{PSL}_3(2)$, $\mathrm{PSL}_3(3)$, or $\mathrm{PSU}_3(3)$ ($\mathrm{PSU}_3(2)$ is solvable). But all of these groups are contained in $CVL2$.

(B.3.2) $G_0 \cong E_6^{\varepsilon}(q)$. By Lemma 12, there are two G_0^*-classes of graph involutions in all subcases. These classes have representatives of the form z and zt, where z is a standard graph automorphism ($z = \gamma$ for $\varepsilon = 1$ and $z = \varphi_q$ for $\varepsilon = -1$) and t is an inner automorphism such that $zt = tz$ (see [3, (19.7)] for q even and [14, Table 4.5.1 and p. 157] for q odd).

We have $C_{G_0}(z) \cong F_4(q)$ for both values of ε (see [14, Table 4.5.1] for q odd and [3, (19.9)(iii)] for q even). If $x = zt$, then, since t and z commute, we have $t \in C_{G_0}(z)$, and x normalizes $C_{G_0}(z)$. If x centralizes $C_{G_0}(z)$, then $t \in Z(C_{G_0}(z)) = Z(F_4(q))$, which is a contradiction since $F_4(q)$ has trivial centre. If $x = z$, then it is easily verified that $|E_6(q)|/|F_4(q)|$ and $|{}^2E_6(q)|/|F_4(q)|$ are even and so, by Lemma 15, there exists a conjugate of $F_4(q)$ that is normalized but not centralized by x. Hence (G, x) cannot be a minimal counterexample.

(B.3.3) $G_0 \cong \mathrm{P}\Omega_d^{\pm}(q)$, $d \geq 8$. Let (V, Q) be the d-dimensional orthogonal space on which $\mathrm{GO}_d^{\pm}(q)$ acts naturally (Q is a nondegenerate quadratic form on V). Then $x \in \mathrm{PCO}_d^{\pm}(q)$ ($\mathrm{PGO}_d^{\pm}(q)$ in the notation of [14, p. 70–72]). By [31, Proposition 1.4(a)], x stabilizes a nontrivial orthogonal decomposition $V = W \perp W'$, since $d > 4$. Moreover, suppose that $b = \dim W' \geq 1$ is minimal. Again by [31, Proposition 1.4(a)], if $b > 4$, then x restricted to W' must stabilize a nontrivial orthogonal decomposition $W' = W'' \perp W'''$ and hence $V = (W + W'') \perp W'''$ is an orthogonal decomposition stabilized by x and contradicts the minimality of b. Hence $b \leq 4$. Now we prove that among the x-invariant nontrivial orthogonal decompositions $V = W \perp W'$ with minimal $b = \dim W'$, there exists at least one for which x acts nontrivially on W. Suppose not. Then x trivially stabilizes an orthogonal decomposition $W = W_{d-b-1} \perp W_1$ where $\dim W_i = i$. Therefore x stabilizes the orthogonal decomposition $V = (W_{d-b-1} \perp W') \perp W_1$ and $b = 1$. Moreover, since x acts nontrivially on V, it acts nontrivially on $W_{d-b-1} \perp W'$, which is a contradiction. Now $\dim W = d - b$ and since $1 \leq b \leq 4$ we have $4 \leq d - 4 \leq d - b \leq d - 1$. Thus we can reduce to the case $\mathrm{P}\Omega_{d-b}^{\pm}(q)$, which is simple unless $d - b = 4$ (and $d = 8$) and $q = 2$ or 3. But in this case, $G_0 \cong \mathrm{P}\Omega_8^{\pm}(2)$, or $\mathrm{P}\Omega_8^{\pm}(3)$, which are contained in $CVL2$.

(B.4) *Graph-field involutions.*

Suppose that x belongs to a G_0^*-coset of $\mathrm{Aut}(G_0)$ represented by a graph-field automorphism. In particular, G_0 is untwisted. By Lemma 9 we may assume that x is a standard graph-field automorphism of G_0 (that is, $x \in \Phi_{G_0}\Gamma_{G_0} - \Phi_{G_0} - \Gamma_{G_0}$ unless $G_0 \cong B_2(2^a)$, $F_4(2^a)$, or $G_2(3^a)$ in which case $x \in \Phi_{G_0}\Gamma_{G_0} - \Phi_{G_0}$).

(B.4.1) G_0 is untwisted and $G_0 \ncong B_2(2^a)$, $F_4(2^a)$, or $G_2(3^a)$. By [14, Theorem 2.5.12(e)], $x = x_\Phi x_\Gamma$ where $x_\Phi \in \Phi_{G_0}$ and $x_\Gamma \in \Gamma_{G_0}$ are commuting involutions. In particular, q is a square and we let $q_0 = q^{1/2}$. Since $\Gamma_{G_0} \neq 1$, G_0 is of type A_n ($n \geq 2$), D_n ($n \geq 4$), or E_6. In each case, x acts noncentrally on a subgroup of type $A_n(q_0)$, $D_n(q_0)$ or $E_6(q_0)$ respectively and thus (G, x) cannot be a minimal counterexample.

(B.4.2) $G_0 \cong B_2(2^a)$ ($a \geq 2$), $F_4(2^a)$ or $G_2(3^a)$. By [14, Theorem 2.5.12(e)], $\Phi_{G_0}\Gamma_{G_0}$ is cyclic and $|\Phi_{G_0}\Gamma_{G_0} : \Phi_{G_0}| = 2$. Thus $x^2 = \varphi_r$. But $x^2 = 1$ so $a = 1$, and $F_4(2)$, $G_2(3) \in CVL2$.

(C) *Sporadic groups.*

Note that $|\mathrm{Out}(G_0)| \in \{1, 2\}$ so either $G = G_0$ or $G = G_0 : 2$. We obtain a contradiction in one of the following ways.

(C.1) By applying Lemma 24 when there is a single G-class of involutions.

(C.2) Using [7], we look for a prime divisor p of $|G|$ such that for every maximal subgroup M, if p divides $|M|$, then M is almost simple or of odd order. If such a prime exists, then we let $y \in G$ be a p-element. Then either $\langle x, y\rangle = G$ is nonsolvable or $\langle x, y\rangle \leq M$ for an almost simple subgroup M in which case (G, x) is not a minimal counterexample.

(C.3) For the remaining cases we use MAGMA. □

5.2. **Proof of Theorem 21.** In this section, we prove that if G is almost simple and $x \in G$ has order 3, then there exists a 2-element $y \in G$ such that $\langle x, y\rangle$ is not solvable.

Definition 25. *The list $CVL3$ consists of the following groups:* $\mathrm{PSU}_3(3)$, $\mathrm{PSL}_3(3)$, $\mathrm{PSp}_4(3)$, $G_2(3)$, $\mathrm{PSU}_4(3)$, ${}^3D_4(3)$, ${}^3D_4(2)$, $\mathrm{PSL}_4(2)$, $\mathrm{PSU}_6(2)$, $\mathrm{PSU}_4(2)$, $\mathrm{PSL}_3(4)$, $\mathrm{PSU}_3(4)$, $\mathrm{PSL}_2(8)$, $\mathrm{PSL}_2(27)$, ${}^2B_2(8)$, $D_4(2)$. *For each $G_0 \in CVL3$ we used* MAGMA *to verify that if $x \in \mathrm{Aut}(G_0)$ has order 3, then there exists a 2-element $y \in G_0$ such that $\langle x, y\rangle$ is not solvable.*

Proof of Theorem 21. Let (G, x) be a minimal counterexample to the claim of Theorem 21. We split the discussion according to the possibilities for G_0.

(A) *Alternating groups.*
Suppose that $G_0 \cong A_n$ and $n \geq 5$. Since $|G : G_0|$ is not divisible by 3 we may assume that $G = G_0$. We may assume $x = (1, 2, 3)$ or $x = (1, 2, 3)(4, 5, 6)x_1$ where $x_1 \in \mathrm{Sym}\{7, \ldots, n\}$ and $x_1^3 = 1$. For $x = (1, 2, 3)$ let $y = (1, 4)(3, 5)$, and for $x = (1, 2, 3)(4, 5, 6)x_1$ let $y = (1, 2)(3, 4)$. Then it is straightforward to check that $\langle x, y\rangle$ is nonsolvable and we have a contradiction.

(B) *Simple groups of Lie type of characteristic r.*

(B.1) $x \in G_0^* = \mathrm{Inndiag}(G_0)$.

(B.1.1) $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$, $q \geq 4$. Here $G_0^* \cong \mathrm{PGL}_2(q)$, and since $|\mathrm{PGL}_2(q) : \mathrm{PSL}_2(q)| = (2, q - 1)$, we have $x \in \mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$. There is only one $\mathrm{PGL}_2(q)$-class of order 3 elements in $\mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$, and since $\mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$ is generated by an order 3 element and an involution unless $q = 9$ ([32, Theorem 6]), we may assume that $q = 9$. However, $\mathrm{PSL}_2(9) \cong A_6$ is excluded by case (A).

(B.1.2) *Unipotent elements ($r = 3$).* Since $|\mathrm{Outdiag}(G_0)|$ is not divisible by r, we may assume that $G = G_0$. Applying the same argument used in Section 5.1.2 case (B.1.1), most possibilities for G_0 are ruled out by choosing appropriate pairs of parabolic subgroups. We are left with $\mathrm{PSL}_2(3^a)$ ($a \geq 2$), ${}^2G_2(3^a)$ ($a \geq 3$ odd), $\mathrm{PSU}_3(3^a)$ ($a \geq 1$), $\mathrm{PSL}_3(3)$, $\mathrm{PSp}_4(3)$, $G_2(3)$, $\mathrm{PSU}_4(3)$, or ${}^3D_4(3)$. The case $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}_2(3^a)$ is eliminated in (B.1.1). We now consider the remaining groups.

(B.1.2.1) $G_0 \cong {}^2G_2(3^a)$, ($a \geq 3$ odd). By [38, p. 87], G_0 has three conjugacy classes of elements of order 3 with representatives X, T and T^{-1}. We have $|C_{G_0}(T)| = 2q^2$ (see [38, III-2 p.78]), so both T and T^{-1} centralize an involution. There is a single class of involutions [38, p. 63] with centralizers isomorphic to $2 \times \mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$ [38, property III, p.62]. Thus T and T^{-1} belong to a $\mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$ subgroup contradicting the minimality of our counterexample. The centralizer of X is a Sylow 3-subgroup of order 3^{3a} [38, p. 78 (3)]. By [14, Theorem 3.3.1(c)], the centre of the Sylow 3-subgroup $U = \langle X_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Pi\rangle$ of $G_2(3^a)$ (untwisted) is $Z(U) = X_{-\alpha_*}X_{\alpha_s}$, where $-\alpha_* = 2\alpha_1 + 3\alpha_2$, and $\alpha_s = 2\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$ is the highest short root of G_2. The graph automorphism of $G_2(3^a)$ normalizes U and interchanges the two root subgroups $X_{-\alpha_*}$ and X_{α_s}. Moreover, it fixes $X_1 = x_{2\alpha_1+3\alpha_2}(1)x_{2\alpha_1+\alpha_2}(1)$. Thus $X_1 \in {}^2G_2(3^a)$, and in fact X_1 belongs to the centre of the ${}^2G_2(3^a)$ Sylow 3-subgroup contained in U. By [38, p.78, (3)], X_1 has order 3. Thus we may assume that $X = X_1$ and now it is clear that X belongs to a ${}^2G_2(3) \cong \mathrm{PSL}_2(8) : 3$ subgroup of G_0, contradicting the minimality of our counterexample.

(B.1.2.2) $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSU}_3(3^a)$ ($a \geq 1$). Let V be the natural module for $\mathrm{GU}_3(3^a)$. Since $x \in G$ is unipotent, its Jordan normal form is either $J_2 + J_1$ or J_3. In the first case x is a transvection, and acts as a non-scalar on a two-dimensional nondegenerate subspace W of V. Therefore we can reduce to the case $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}_2(3^a)$ when $a \geq 2$. Now suppose that x has Jordan normal form J_3. By [26, Proposition 4.5.5(II)], $\mathrm{PSU}_3(3^a)$ has an $\mathrm{SO}_3(3^a)$ subgroup and $\mathrm{SO}_3(3^a)$ contains an element x_1 with a single J_3 block (by [6, Section 3.3] for example). Now x_1 is $\mathrm{GU}_3(q)$-conjugate to x since two elements in $\mathrm{GU}_3(q)$ are conjugate if and only they have the same Jordan form. Thus (G, x) cannot be a minimal counterexample for $a \geq 2$. If $a = 1$, then we have $\mathrm{PSU}_3(3) \in CVL3$.

(B.1.2.3) The remaining groups G_0 satisfy $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}_3(3)$, $\mathrm{PSp}_4(3)$, $G_2(3)$, $\mathrm{PSU}_4(3)$, ${}^3D_4(3)$ and are contained in $CVL3$.

(B.1.3) *Semisimple elements ($r \neq 3$) G_0 exceptional or a group of type D_4.* By Lemma 8 and the fact that $O^{r'}(C_{G^*}(x))$ is nontrivial (see [14, Table 4.7.3.A]), x belongs to a maximal parabolic subgroup of G. Therefore we can apply Lemma 7(b), and arguing as in Case (B.1.2) of Section 5.1.2, we eliminate all possible G_0 except ${}^2F_4(2)'$, $G_2(2)' \cong \mathrm{PSU}_3(3)$ and ${}^3D_4(2)$. Now ${}^2F_4(2)'$ has only one class of elements of order 3 and has standard generators a, b of order 2 and 3 respectively. Hence x is conjugate to b and ${}^2F_4(2)'$ cannot be a minimal counterexample. The remaining groups $G_2(2)' \cong \mathrm{PSU}_3(3)$ and ${}^3D_4(2)$ are contained in $CVL3$.

(B.1.4) *Semisimple elements ($r \neq 3$), G_0 classical.* By [6, Lemma 3.11], x lifts to an element of $\widehat{G}$, which we continue to call x, where $\widehat{G} \cong \mathrm{GL}_n^\varepsilon(q)$ or $\widehat{G} \cong \mathrm{Sp}_n(q)$ or $\widehat{G} \cong \Omega_n^\varepsilon(q)$, and $o(x) = 3$ unless $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}_n^\varepsilon(q)$, and $3 | (q - \varepsilon, n)$, in which case we may assume that $o(x) = 3^k$. Let V be the natural $\widehat{G}$-module of dimension n. Since x is semisimple, V decomposes as a sum of x-modules

$$V = U_1 \perp \cdots \perp U_k \perp (W_{k+1} \oplus W'_{k+1}) \perp \cdots \perp (W_{k+s} \oplus W'_{k+s}), \tag{1}$$

where x acts irreducibly on each U_i, W_i and W'_i, the W_i and W'_i are totally singular, and the U_i and $(W_i \oplus W'_i)$ are nondegenerate (except in the linear case of course). If x lifts to an element of order 3 in $\widehat{G}$, then the dimension of each of these modules is at most 2 since $3 | q^2 - 1$ (and therefore $\mathrm{GL}_m(q^k)$ does not contain elements of order 3 acting irreducibly when $m \geq 3$). In the rest of this section, X will stand for one of the irreducible subspaces U_i, W_i or W'_i in (1). We note that if x acts trivially on X, then $\dim X = 1$ since we are assuming that X is an irreducible x-module.

(B.1.4.1) $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}_n(q)$. If x lifts to an element of order 3 in $\widehat{G}$ and $q \geq 4$, then minimality of (G, x) implies $n = 2$ and we are done by case (B.1.1). If $q \leq 3$, then $q = 2$ since $r \neq 3$. In this case, since $\mathrm{PSL}_2(2)$ is solvable, we have the following possibilities: If there exists X in (1) of dimension 1, then, by minimality, $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}_3(2) \cong \mathrm{PSL}_2(7)$ (which is eliminated in (B.1.1)), and if every X in (1) is 2-dimensional, then minimality implies that $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}_4(2) \cong A_8$. If x does not lift to an element of order 3 in $\widehat{G}$, then all of the X in (1) are 3-dimensional (see the proof of [6, Lemma 3.11] for example) and it follows that $n = 3$ by minimality of (G, x). Thus it remains to check $G_0 = \mathrm{PSL}_3(q)$ where $(3, q - 1) = 3$, x has order 3^k, x acts irreducibly and and x^3 acts as a scalar (see (B.1.4.5) below).

(B.1.4.2) $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSU}_n(q)$.

(B.1.4.2.1) If x does not lift to an element of order 3, then, as in (B.1.4.1), all of the modules in (1) are 3-dimensional and it follows by minimality that either $n = 3$, $q \geq 4$, $(3, q + 1) = 3$ and x acts irreducibly (see (B.1.4.5) below) or $q = 2$ and $G_0 = \mathrm{PSU}_6(2) \in CVL3$ ($\mathrm{PSU}_3(2)$ is solvable).

(B.1.4.2.2) If x lifts to an element of order 3, then we have $\dim X \leq 2$ for all X in (1). If $q \geq 4$, then minimality implies that $n = 2$ and we are done by case (B.1.1) since $\mathrm{PSU}_2(q) \cong \mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$. If $q = 2$, then it suffice to check $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSU}_4(2)$, which is contained in $CVL3$.

(B.1.4.3) $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSp}_n(q)$ ($n \geq 4$). Since x lifts to an element of order 3 we have $\dim X \leq 2$ for all X in (1). First suppose that there is a 2-dimensional X in (1) (on which x necessarily acts nontrivially). If X is totally singular and $q \geq 4$, then we can reduce to the case of $\mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$ by restricting to X. If X is totally singular and $q = 2$, then we can reduce to the case of $\mathrm{PSp}_4(2)$ by restriction to $X \oplus X'$. Thus we may now assume that all of the 2-dimensional spaces in (1) are nondegenerate. If $q \geq 4$, then we can reduce to the case $\mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$ by restricting to X. If $q = 2$, then we can reduce to the case of $\mathrm{PSp}_4(2)$ by restricting to $X \perp Y$, where Y is a nondegenerate subspace in (1) (necessarily of dimension 2) or is a sum $W_i \oplus W'_i$ of totally singular 1-spaces in (1).

Finally, it remains to consider the case where all of the X are 1-dimensional (and hence totally singular). Choose X on which x acts nontrivially. Again we can reduce to the case of $\mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$ by restriction to $X \oplus X'$ when $q \geq 4$ (note that since $X \oplus X'$ is nondegenerate, x does not act as a scalar on $X \oplus X'$ since $Z(\mathrm{Sp}_2(q)) = \langle \pm I_2 \rangle$). If $q = 2$, then we reduce to the case of $\mathrm{PSp}_4(2) \cong S_6$ by restricting to $(X \oplus X') \perp (Y \oplus Y')$ where Y is another totally singular 1-space in (1). Thus in all cases, we have shown that if $G_0 = \mathrm{PSp}_n(q)$ is a minimal counterexample, then $(n, q) = (4, 2)$ and $\mathrm{PSp}_n(q) \cong S_6$; but this case is eliminated in (A).

(B.1.4.4) $G_0 \cong \mathrm{P}\Omega^{\varepsilon}_n(q)$ $(n \geq 7)$ Since x lifts to an element of order 3 we have $\dim X \leq 2$ for all X in (1). If there is a totally singular 2-dimensional X in (1), then we can reduce to the case $\mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$ for $q \geq 4$ by restricting to X. If $q = 2$, then we note that $\Omega^{\varepsilon}_k(2)$ is solvable for $k \leq 4$; so choose another irreducible subspace Y in (1). If Y is nondegenerate, then we reduce to $\mathrm{P}\Omega_5(2)$ or $\mathrm{P}\Omega^{\pm}_6(2)$ by restricting to $(X \oplus X') \perp Y$ while if Y is totally singular, then we can reduce to $\mathrm{PSL}_3(2)$ or $\mathrm{PSL}_4(2)$ by restricting to $X \oplus Y$. If there is a 2-dimensional nondegenerate X in (1), then let $\widetilde{X}$ denote the sum of the remaining subspace in (1). We can reduce to the case $\mathrm{P}\Omega^{\varepsilon}_{n-2}(q)$ by restricting to $\widetilde{X}$ if x acts nontrivially on $\widetilde{X}$. If x acts trivially on $\widetilde{X}$, then we can reduce to the case of $\mathrm{P}\Omega_5(q) = \mathrm{PSp}_4(q)$ (by restricting to $X \perp Y$ where Y is any 3-dimensional nondegenerate subspace of $\widetilde{X}$). It remains to consider the case where each X is 1-dimensional. Similarly, we can reduce to the case of $\mathrm{P}\Omega^{\varepsilon}_{n-1}(q)$ or $\mathrm{P}\Omega^{\varepsilon}_{n-2}(q)$ and since $n \geq 7$ it is clear that (G, x) cannot be a minimal counterexample here either.

(B.1.4.5) $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}^{\varepsilon}_3(q)$, with $(3, q - \varepsilon) = 3$, x irreducible and x does not lift to an order 3 element in $\mathrm{GL}^{\varepsilon}_3(q)$. If this is the case, then $x^3 = \lambda I_3$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_{q^u}$ ($u = 1$ for $\varepsilon = 1$, otherwise $u = 2$). We note that λ has no cube root in $\mathbb{F}_{q^u}$ otherwise we can choose $\mu \in \mathbb{F}_{q^u}$ such that $\mu^3 = \lambda^{-1}$, in which case $(\mu x)^3 = 1$ and μx is a lift of x of order 3. In particular, x has rational canonical form

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \lambda \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\langle x, \mathrm{PSL}^{\varepsilon}_3(q) \rangle = \mathrm{PGL}^{\varepsilon}_3(q)$ since we cannot write $x = x_0(\mu I_3)$ for $x_0 \in \mathrm{SL}^{\varepsilon}_3(q)$ and $\mu I_3 \in Z(\mathrm{GL}^{\varepsilon}_3(q))$ (for $\det x = \lambda$, $\det(\mu x_0) = \mu^3$ and λ has no cube root in $\mathbb{F}_{q^u}$).

Now we choose $y \in G_0$. If $r = 2$, then y is chosen so that its preimage in $\mathrm{GL}^{\varepsilon}_3(q)$ has a Jordan normal form J_3 (a regular unipotent element of order 4). If $r > 3$ we choose y as follows. For $\varepsilon = 1$, take y to be the 2-part of the image in $\mathrm{PSL}_3(q)$ of $\mathrm{diag}[A, 1/\det(A)] \in \mathrm{SL}_3(q)$ where $A \in \mathrm{GL}_2(q)$ is a Singer cycle (of order $q^2 - 1$). For $\varepsilon = -1$, take y to be the 2-part of the image in $\mathrm{PSU}_3(q)$ of $\mathrm{diag}[a, a^{-q}, a^{q-1}] \in \mathrm{SU}_3(q)$, where $a \in F^{\times}_{q^2}$ has order $q^2 - 1$. In both cases $o(y) = (q^2 - 1)_2 \geq 8$.

Let $M_1, \dots, M_k$ be the maximal subgroups of $G = \langle x, \mathrm{PSL}^{\varepsilon}_3(q) \rangle = \mathrm{PGL}^{\varepsilon}_3(q)$ containing y. We aim to show that $|x^G| > |x^G \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^k M_i|$, in which case there exists $g \in G$ such that $x^g \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^k M_i$. It would then follow that $\langle x^g, y \rangle = \langle x, y^g \rangle = G$ and hence that (G, x) is not a minimal counterexample.

Let $Y_1, \dots, Y_l$ be representatives of distinct conjugacy classes of $M_1, \dots, M_k$ and let n_i be the number of distinct conjugates of Y_i containing y. First note that

$$|x^G \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^k M_i| \leq \sum_{i=1}^k |x^G \cap M_i| = \sum_{i=1}^l n_i |x^G \cap Y_i|.$$

By double counting, we have $n_i = |y^G \cap Y_i||G : N_G(Y_i)|/|y^G|$. Therefore the inequality $|x^G| > |x^G \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^k M_i|$ will follow if

$$|x^G| > \sum_{i=1}^l \frac{|y^G \cap Y_i|}{|N_G(Y_i)|} |C_G(y)||x^G \cap Y_i|. \tag{2}$$

We aim to bound above the right-hand side of (2) by a quantity less than $|x^G|$. Since x is semisimple it can be diagonalized over the algebraic closure of $\mathbb{F}_q$. Moreover, x acts irreducibly on V. These two facts imply that $|C_G(x)| = (q^2 + \varepsilon q + 1)$ and $|x^G| = q^3(q - \varepsilon)(q^2 - 1)$.

Using the lists of maximal subgroups of $\mathrm{PGL}_3^\varepsilon(q)$ in [5] (see also [14, Theorem 6.5.3]) and since we may assume that each Y_i contains elements of order $o(y)$ and must not be almost simple (by minimality of G), we find in each case that there is at most one possible isomorphism type for Y_i. Also, it is easy to see that $N_G(Y_i) = Y_i$ since these subgroups are maximal subgroups of G.

If $r = 2$ and $q = 4$, then we have $\mathrm{PSL}_3(4)$, $\mathrm{PSU}_3(4) \in CVL3$, so suppose that $r = 2$ and $q \geq 8$. The only irreducible maximal subgroups Y_i containing y (a regular unipotent element) that are not almost simple are isomorphic to $\mathrm{PGU}_3(2)$ in the unitary case and there are no such groups in the linear case (see also [26, Proposition 4.5.3]). There are at most three such G-classes of maximal subgroups by [26, Proposition 4.5.3] and $|x^G \cap Y_i|$ is at most 80 (the number of order 3 elements in $\mathrm{PGU}_3(2)$). It is well known that $|C_{\mathrm{PGU}_3(q)}(y)| = q^2$ and so the right-hand side of (2) is at most $240q^2$ and therefore (2) holds since $q \geq 8$.

Now suppose that $r \geq 5$ and recall that $o(y) = (q^2 - 1)_2 \geq 8$. Here the only possibility is that Y_i is of type $(q - \varepsilon) \wr S_3$. We make the crude estimate $|x^G \cap Y_i| \leq |Y_i| = 6(q - \varepsilon)^2$ and note that $|C_{\mathrm{PGL}_3^\varepsilon(q)}(y)| = q^2 - 1$ (since the eigenvalues of y are distinct and so its centralizer in $\mathrm{PGL}_3^\varepsilon(q)$ is a maximal torus). By [26, Proposition 4.2.9], there is only one G-class of such maximal subgroups. Thus the right-hand side of (2) is at most $6(q-\varepsilon)^2(q^2-1)$, which is less than $|x^G| = q^3(q^2 - 1)(q - \varepsilon)$ since $q \geq 5$ (for $\varepsilon = +$ and $-$). That is, (2) holds and (G, x) is not a minimal counterexample in this case either.

(B.2) *Field automorphisms.* Suppose that x is a field automorphism. Since x has order 3, we have $q = r^a$ where a is divisible by 3 and in particular $q \geq 8$. Let $q_0 = q^{1/3}$. As in Case (B.2) of Section 5.1.2, choosing a suitable $\mathrm{SL}_2(q)$ subgroup of G_0, eliminates all cases except when G_0 is $\mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$ or a Suzuki–Ree group.

(B.2.1) $G_0 \cong \mathrm{PSL}_2(q)$. By Lemma 14(i) we have $C_{G_0}(x) \cong \mathrm{PSL}_2(q_0)$. Therefore 3 divides $|G_0 : C_{G_0}(x)|$ and $Z(\mathrm{PSL}_2(q_0)) = 1$ for all q_0. Hence, by Lemma 15 there exists a G-conjugate of $C_{G_0}(x)$ that is normalized but not centralized by x, and (G, x) cannot be a minimal counterexample for $q_0 \geq 4$. If $q_0 \leq 3$, then we have $G_0 \in CVL3$.

(B.2.2) $G_0 \cong {}^2F_4(2^a)$ ($a \geq 3$ odd). By [33, Main Theorem], G_0 has a maximal subgroup $\mathrm{PGU}_3(2^a) : 2$. By the corollary to the main theorem of [33], x normalizes and does not centralize such a maximal subgroup and thus (G, x) cannot be a minimal counterexample.

(B.2.3) $G_0 \cong {}^2G_2(3^a)$ ($a \geq 3$ odd). By [14, Proposition 4.9.1], we have $O^{3'}(C_{G_0}(x)) \cong {}^2G_2(q_0)$ and $C_{G_0}(x) \cong (O^{3'}(C_{G_0}(x)))^* \cong ({}^2G_2(q_0))^* \cong {}^2G_2(q_0)$. In particular, let $t \in C_{G_0}(x)$ be an involution, so that $t \in G_0$ and x centralizes t. Since x acts on G_0 and x centralizes t, it follows that x acts on $C_{G_0}(t)$ and hence also on $O^{3'}(C_{G_0}(t))$. By [14, Table 4.5.1], $O^{3'}(C_{G_0}(t)) \cong \mathrm{PSL}_2(3^a)$. Note that x does not centralize $O^{3'}(C_{G_0}(t))$ and so (G, x) cannot be a minimal counterexample. To see this, note that $C_{G_0}(x) \cong {}^2G_2(q_0)$ does not contain an element of order $(3^a + 1)/2$ (see the list of maximal tori of ${}^2G_2(q_0)$ [23, Section 2.2]), while $\mathrm{PSL}_2(3^a)$ does.

(B.2.4) $G_0 \cong {}^2B_2(2^a)$ ($a \geq 3$ odd). We derive a contradiction by proving the existence of an involution $y \in G_0$ satisfying $\langle x, y\rangle = \langle G_0, x\rangle$ (under the assumption that (G, x) is a minimal counterexample). We bound the number $|\Gamma|$ of involutions $y \in G_0$ such that $\langle x, y\rangle \neq \langle G_0, x\rangle$ as in [16, Lemma 3.12]:

$$\begin{aligned}|\Gamma| \leq& (q_0^3-1)(q_0^2+1) + q_0^2(q_0^3-1)(q_0^2+1)/2 + \\ & 2q_0^2(q_0^3 + (2q_0^3)^{1/2}+1)(q_0 + (2q_0)^{1/2}+1)(q_0-1) + q_0^2(q_0^2+1)(q_0^2-1).\end{aligned}$$

The total number of involutions in G_0 is $(q^2 + 1)(q - 1)$ (see [36, Propositions 1 and 7]). The right-hand side of the last inequality is less than $(q^2 + 1)(q - 1)$ unless $q_0 = 2$. If $q_0 = 2$, then we have $G_0 \cong {}^2B_2(8) \in CVL3$.

(B.3) *Graph automorphism.* Suppose that x belongs to a G_0^*-coset of $\mathrm{Aut}(G_0)$ represented by a graph automorphism. We can argue in a similar way as in Case (B.3) of Section 5.1.2 to eliminate all cases except $G_0 = D_4(q)$ and $G_0 = {}^3D_4(q)$ where $q = q_0^3$.

(B.3.1) $G_0 \cong D_4(r^a)$ or ${}^3D_4(r^a)$, $r \neq 3$. By [27, Proposition 1.4.1] and [29, Main Theorem] (see also [14, Table 4.7.3A]) there are two G_0^*-classes of graph automorphisms and either $C_{G_0}(x) \cong G_2(q)$ or $C_{G_0}(x) \cong \mathrm{PGL}_3^{\varepsilon}(q)$, where ε is determined by the congruence $q \equiv \varepsilon \pmod 3$. Observe that in both cases $C_{G_0}(x)$ is almost simple provided $q \neq 2$, and in particular has a trivial centre. Moreover, 3 divides $|G_0 : G_2(q)|$ and $|G_0 : \mathrm{PGL}_3^{\varepsilon}(q)|$. Thus we obtain a contradiction to the minimality of (G, x) by Lemma 15 for $q \neq 2$. For $q = 2$ we have $G_0 \in CVL3$.

(B.3.2) $G_0 \cong D_4(3^a)$ or ${}^3D_4(3^a)$. By [14, Proposition 4.9.2(g)], x is G_0^*-conjugate to $\gamma^{\pm 1}$ or $(\gamma z)^{\pm 1}$ where $\gamma \in \Gamma_{G_0}$ if $G_0 \cong D_4(q)$ and $\gamma \in \Phi_{G_0}$ if $G_0 \cong {}^3D_4(q)$, and z is a nontrivial element of a long root subgroup $Z = C_{\overline{X}_{-\alpha_*}}(\sigma) \leq G_0$, where σ is the Steinberg endomorphism used for the σ-setup defining G_0 ([14, Example 3.2.6]). Clearly, we may assume that $x = \gamma$ or γz. If $x = \gamma$, then, by [14, Proposition 4.9.2(b5)], we have $C_{G_0}(x) \cong G_2(q)$ and we obtain a contradiction by Lemma 15 as in (B.3.1). Now suppose that $x = \gamma z$. By [14, Proposition 4.9.2], we have $C_{G_0}(x) = C_{C_{G_0}(\gamma)}(z)$. Now $z \in C_{G_0}(\gamma) \cong G_2(q)$ and $G_2(q)$ has trivial centre, thus $C_{G_0}(x) = C_{C_{G_0}(\gamma)}(z) \lneqq G_2(q) \cong C_{G_0}(\gamma)$. However, since γ and z commute, the element $x = \gamma z$ normalizes $C_{G_0}(\gamma) \cong G_2(q)$. Now $C_{G_0}(\gamma)$ is not centralized by z, so $x = \gamma z$ normalizes but does not centralize $C_{G_0}(\gamma) \cong G_2(q)$, which contradicts the minimality of (G, x).

(B.4) *Graph-field automorphisms.* Suppose that x is a graph-field automorphism. Arguments similar to those used in (B.4) in Section 5.1.2, eliminate all cases except the case $G_0 = D_4(q_0^3)$. By [14, Proposition 4.9.1] we have $O^{r'}(C_{G_0}(x)) \cong {}^3D_4(q_0)$ and $C_{G_0^*}(x) \cong (O^{r'}(C_{G_0}(x)))^* \cong {}^3D_4(q_0)$. Hence $C_{G_0^*}(x)$ is simple and since $C_{G_0}(x) \trianglelefteq C_{G_0^*}(x)$, we have $C_{G_0}(x) = C_{G_0^*}(x) \cong {}^3D_4(q_0)$. Now 3 divides $|D_4(q) : {}^3D_4(q_0)|$ and ${}^3D_4(q_0)$ has trivial centre, so we may apply Lemma 15 to eliminate this case.

(C) *Sporadic groups.*

We may assume that $G = G_0$ in all cases since $|\mathrm{Out}(G_0)| = 1$ or 2 and x has order 3. In order to eliminate a given G_0, it is sufficient to show that x belongs to an almost simple subgroup $H \leq G$. This is immediate when G_0 has a single conjugacy class of elements of order 3 and there exists almost simple subgroup H of order divisible by 3. More generally, we can eliminate a conjugacy class C of order 3 elements if there exists a unique conjugacy class of elements of order $3k$ that powers up to C and there exists an almost simple subgroup H that contains elements of order $3k$. We use [7, 1] to do this. When such an argument cannot be established, we use MAGMA. ☐

REFERENCES

[1] Rachel Abbott, John N. Bray, Simon Nickerson, Steve Linton, Simon P. Norton, Richard Parker, Ibrahim Suleiman, Jonathan Tripp, Peter Walsh, and Robert A. Wilson, *ATLAS of finite group representations.*

[2] Michael Aschbacher, *Finite group theory*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, 1986.

[3] Michael Aschbacher and Gary M. Seitz, *Involutions in Chevalley groups over fields of even order*, Nagoya Math. J. **63** (1976), 1–91.

[4] Wieb Bosma, John Cannon, and Catherine Playoust, *The* MAGMA *algebra system I: The user language*, J. Symbolic Comput. **24** (1997), no. 3-4, 235–265.

[5] John N. Bray, Derek Holt, and Colva M. Roney-Dougal, *Maximal subgroups of classical groups of low dimension*, LMS Lecture Note Series, Cambridge University Press, to appear.

[6] Timothy C. Burness, *Fixed point ratios in actions in finite classical groups II*, Journal of Algebra **309** (2007), no. 1, 80–138.

[7] J. H. Conway, R. T. Curtis, Simon P. Norton, Richard Parker, and Robert A. Wilson, *Atlas of finite groups*, 1985.

[8] Silvio Dolfi, Robert M. Guralnick, Marcel Herzog, and Cheryl E. Praeger, *A new solvability criterion for finite groups*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) **85** (2012), no. 2, 269–281. MR 2901064

[9] Paul Flavell, *Finite groups in which every two elements generate a soluble subgroup*, Invent. Math. **121** (1995), no. 2, 279–285. MR 1346207 (96i:20018)

[10] Paul Flavell, Simon Guest, and Robert M. Guralnick, *Characterizations of the solvable radical*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **138** (2010), no. 4, 1161–1170.

[11] Michael Giudici, *Maximal subgroups of almost simple groups with socle* PSL$(2, q)$, (2007).

[12] Nikolai Gordeev, Fritz Grunewald, Boris Kunyavskii, and Eugene Plotkin, *From Thompson to Baer–Suzuki: a sharp characterization of the solvable radical*, Journal of Algebra **323** (2010), no. 10, 2888–2904.

[13] Daniel Gorenstein and Richard Lyons, *The local structure of finite groups of characteristic* 2 *type*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **42** (1983), no. 276, vii+731.

[14] Daniel Gorenstein, Richard Lyons, and Ronald Solomon, *The classification of the finite simple groups number 3 part I chapter A*, vol. 40, 1998.

[15] Simon Guest, *A solvable version of the Baer–Suzuki theorem*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **362** (2010), 5909–5946.

[16] ———, *Further solvable analogues of the Baer–Suzuki theorem and generation of nonsolvable groups*, J. Algebra **360** (2012), 92–114.

[17] Simon Guest and Dan Levy, *A remark on two solvability criteria of Thompson*, Comm. Algebra **41** (2013), no. 1, 309–311.

[18] R. M. Guralnick and J. S. Wilson, *The probability of generating a finite soluble group*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **81** (2000), no. 2, 405–427. MR 1770615 (2002g:20113)

[19] Robert Guralnick and Gunter Malle, *Products of conjugacy classes and fixed point spaces*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **25** (2012), no. 1, 77–121. MR 2833479

[20] Robert M. Guralnick, Boris Kunyavskii, Eugene Plotkin, and Aner Shalev, *Thompson-like characterizations of the solvable radical*, Journal of Algebra **300** (2006), no. 1, 363–375.

[21] Robert M. Guralnick and Jan Saxl, *Generation of finite almost simple groups by conjugates*, Journal of Algebra **268** (2003), no. 2, 519–571.

[22] P. Hall, *A characteristic property of soluble groups*, J. London Math. Soc. **S1-12**, no. 2, 198. MR 1575073

[23] William M. Kantor and Ákos Seress, *Prime power graphs for groups of Lie type*, J. Algebra **247** (2002), no. 2, 370–434. MR 1877859 (2003a:20026)

[24] Gil Kaplan and Dan Levy, *Multiplicities in Sylow sequences and the solvable radical*, Bull. Aust. Math. Soc. **78** (2008), no. 3, 477–486. MR 2472282 (2009k:20046)

[25] ———, *Solvability of finite groups via conditions on products of 2-elements and odd p-elements*, Bull. Aust. Math. Soc. **82** (2010), no. 2, 265–273. MR 2685150 (2011j:20039)

[26] Peter Kleidman and Martin W. Liebeck, *The subgroup structure of the finite classical groups*, vol. 129, Cambridge University Press, 1990.

[27] Peter B. Kleidman, *The maximal subgroups of the finite* 8*-dimensional orthogonal groups* $P\Omega_8^+(q)$ *and of their automorphism groups*, Journal of Algebra **110** (1987), no. 1, 173–242.

[28] ———, *The subgroup structure of some finite simple groups*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 1987.

[29] ———, *The maximal subgroups of the Steinberg triality groups* ${}^3D_4(q)$ *and of their automorphism groups*, Journal of Algebra **115** (1988), no. 1, 182–199.

[30] Martin W. Liebeck, *The classification of finite simple Moufang loops*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **102** (1987), no. 1, 33–47.

[31] Martin W. Liebeck and Jan Saxl, *Minimal degrees of primitive permutation groups, with an application to monodromy groups of covers of Riemann surfaces*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **63** (1991), no. 2, 266–314.

[32] A. M. Macbeath, *Generators of the linear fractional groups*, Number Theory (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Vol. XII, Houston, Tex., 1967), Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1969, pp. 14–32. MR 0262379 (41 #6987)

[33] Gunter Malle, *The maximal subgroups of* ${}^2F_4(q^2)$, Journal of Algebra **139** (1991), no. 1, 52–69.

[34] Gunter Malle, Jan Saxl, and Thomas Weigel, *Generation of classical groups*, Geom. Dedicata **49** (1994), no. 1, 85–116.

[35] G. A. Miller, *The product of two or more groups*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **19** (1913), no. 6, 303–310. MR 1559346

[36] Michio Suzuki, *On a class of doubly transitive groups*, Ann. of Math. (2) **75** (1962), 105–145.

[37] John G. Thompson, *Nonsolvable finite groups all of whose local subgroups are solvable*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **74** (1968), 383–437.

[38] Harold N. Ward, *On Ree's series of simple groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **121** (1966), 62–89.

Mathematics, University of Southampton, Highfield, SO17 1BJ, United Kingdom
E-mail address: `s.d.guest@soton.ac.uk`

The School of Computer Sciences, The Academic College of Tel-Aviv-Yaffo, 2 Rabenu Yeruham St., Tel-Aviv 61083, Israel
E-mail address: `danlevy@trendline.co.il`